

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8, 11-15, and 18-20 are pending in this application, with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 4-8 and 11-14 are withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected embodiment. Claims 9-10 and 16-17 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 11-15, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,846,279 (Stieler).

Claims 1-8, 11-15, and 18-20 are alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Stieler in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,610,491 (Gotz).

The present invention relates to a drive for a cylinder of a rotary press. According to one embodiment of the present invention, a folder includes a knife cylinder 1, a folding cylinder 2, and a folding jaw cylinder 3 which are mounted between sidewalls 5, 6 (see paragraph [0018]; and Fig. 1 of the application as originally filed). The folding cylinder 2 includes cylinder segments 12 and 14 which are rotatable with respect to each other. Further, each of the cylinder segments is connected to its own dedicated drive 9, 15; the electric motor 9 drives a spur gear 16 fixed to cylinder segment 12 and the electric motor 15 drives a spur gear 17 fixed to cylinder segment 14 (see paragraph [0019]). The folding jaw cylinder 3 operates with the folding cylinder 2 and the folding jaw cylinder 3 bears a spur gear 23 driven by its own dedicated electric motor 25 (see paragraph [0020]).

The teeth of spur gears 17, 23 engage one another. However, there is no drive connection between the spur gears 17, 23 during operation (see paragraph [0021], lines 1-3). Rather, a spacing s is present between the flanks of the meshing teeth (see paragraph [0021], lines 3-5; and Fig. 5).

The spur gears 17, 23 provide collision protection between folding blades of the folding cylinder 2 and the folding jaw cylinder 3 (paragraph [0021], lines 9-15).

Independent claim 1 is amended to recite “means for limiting deviation of at least one of said cylinders and said cylinder segments from a desired rotational position, said means for limiting deviation comprising rotation-limiting spur gears fixed to said second cylinder and at least one of said cylinder segments, said rotation-limiting spur gears each having teeth with tooth flanks, said rotation-limiting spur gears meshing with rotational flank play and without said tooth flanks touching one another during operation so that there is no drive connection between the rotation-limiting spur gears during operation”. Support for the amendment is found in paragraphs [0021] and [0031]; and Fig. 5 of the application as originally filed.

Stieler fails to disclose the above limitation. More specifically, Stieler fails to disclose, teach or suggest the recited configuration of spur gears depicted in Fig. 5 of the present application in which there is no drive connection between the spur gears. Rather, Stieler discloses that there is a drive connection between each pair of meshed spur gears. In the rejection, the Examiner states that “Stieler discloses exactly the claimed invention.” The Examiner refers to col. 4, lines 51-56 of Stieler as disclosing the claimed means for limiting deviation. However, this section of Stieler merely states that limit switches 38, 39 or stops 36, 37 may be present on the cylinders as shown in Fig. 3 to limit mutual rotatability of parts 12, 14. However, there is absolutely no suggestion that spur gears could be used to achieve the same purpose.

Moreover, independent claim 1 is amended to recite “said means for limiting deviation comprising rotation-limiting spur gears fixed to said second cylinder and at least one of said cylinder segments”. Accordingly, the claimed spur gears are on two different cylinders. The

limit switches or stops of Stieler referred to by the Examiner relate to mutual rotation of two parts of one cylinder. Thus, Stieler fails to disclose “said means for limiting rotation comprising rotation-limiting spur gears fixed to said second cylinder and at least one of said cylinder segments”, as now recited in independent claim 1.

For all of the above reasons, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Stieler.

Gotz fails to disclose what Stieler lacks. Gotz relates to an electrical drive system for the positioning of rotating equipment. Angle position control and other controls are accomplished by a signal processor that receives feedback (see col. 2, line 56 to col. 3, line 7) and observes limiting values (col. 3, lines 13-15). However, there is no mention whatsoever of spur gears that can be used as a “means for limiting deviation of at least one of said cylinders and said cylinder segments from a desired rotational position”, as expressly recited in independent claim 1.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, independent claim 1 is allowable over Stieler and Gotz.

Dependent claims 2-3, 15 and 18-20 are allowable for at least the same reasons as is independent claim 1.

Regarding withdrawn claims 4-8 and 11-14, these claims depend from independent claim 1 and therefore, upon allowance of independent claim 1, withdrawn claims 4-8 and 11-14 should be considered.

The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is solicited.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, suggestions, or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order to facilitate reaching a resolution of any outstanding issues.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By /Alfred W. Froebrich/
Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: November 24, 2008